

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 10/028,130	Applicant(s) LANDRY-COLTRAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Pamela R. Schwartz	Art Unit 1774	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** rejected

 (1) Pamela R. Schwartz.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Ms. Blank.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 9 February 2005
**Time:** \_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*rejections of Maeda et al.*

Claims discussed:

21, 29


Prior art documents discussed:

*Maeda et al. and Ogawa et al.*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner explained how she was interpreting the claim language (see the final rejection). The examiner discussed with Ms. Blank possible ways of amending the claims to overcome rejection over Maeda et al. The examiner also indicated that she had not found support for "by weight" in claim 21.